

Whither regional studies?

Pike, Andy

Postprint / Postprint

Zeitschriftenartikel / journal article

Zur Verfügung gestellt in Kooperation mit / provided in cooperation with:

www.peerproject.eu

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Pike, A. (2007). Whither regional studies? *Regional Studies*, 41(9), 1143-1148. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00343400701675587>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter dem "PEER Licence Agreement zur Verfügung" gestellt. Nähere Auskünfte zum PEER-Projekt finden Sie hier: <http://www.peerproject.eu> Gewährt wird ein nicht exklusives, nicht übertragbares, persönliches und beschränktes Recht auf Nutzung dieses Dokuments. Dieses Dokument ist ausschließlich für den persönlichen, nicht-kommerziellen Gebrauch bestimmt. Auf sämtlichen Kopien dieses Dokuments müssen alle Urheberrechtshinweise und sonstigen Hinweise auf gesetzlichen Schutz beibehalten werden. Sie dürfen dieses Dokument nicht in irgendeiner Weise abändern, noch dürfen Sie dieses Dokument für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, aufführen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Mit der Verwendung dieses Dokuments erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen an.

gesis
Leibniz-Institut
für Sozialwissenschaften

Terms of use:

This document is made available under the "PEER Licence Agreement". For more Information regarding the PEER-project see: <http://www.peerproject.eu> This document is solely intended for your personal, non-commercial use. All of the copies of this documents must retain all copyright information and other information regarding legal protection. You are not allowed to alter this document in any way, to copy it for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the document in public, to perform, distribute or otherwise use the document in public.

By using this particular document, you accept the above-stated conditions of use.

Mitglied der

Leibniz-Gemeinschaft



Whither regional studies?

| | |
|------------------|---|
| Journal: | <i>Regional Studies</i> |
| Manuscript ID: | CRES-2007-0182.R1 |
| Manuscript Type: | Main Section |
| JEL codes: | R - Urban, Rural, and Regional Economics, R0 - General < R - Urban, Rural, and Regional Economics, R1 - General Regional Economics < R - Urban, Rural, and Regional Economics |
| Keywords: | editorial, regional |
| | |

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1 **Whither regional studies?**
2

3
4
5
6 Revised Editorial for the ‘Whither regional studies?’ Special Issue
7
8
9

10
11
12
13 **Introduction**
14

15
16
17
18 Regional studies are at a vibrant conjuncture. ‘Regions’ continue to provide a conceptual
19
20 and analytical focus for often overlapping concerns with economic, social, political,
21
22 cultural and ecological change. In the context of increased interest in inter- and multi-
23
24 disciplinary approaches, ‘regions’ remain an arena in which synthesis across disciplines
25
26 – including economics, geography, planning, politics and sociology – can take place.
27
28 Indeed, this cross-disciplinary ethos has long been integral to the Regional Studies
29
30 Association and its journal *Regional Studies* (Pike *et al.* 2007). The regional studies field
31
32 remains distinctive in its strong empirical grounding upon which contributors have built a
33
34 sophisticated literature encompassing a range of research from a variety of disciplinary
35
36 angles. Yet regional studies is a far from static entity with clearly or simply defined and
37
38 rigidly demarcated boundaries. Sharing common concerns across and through multi- and
39
40 inter-disciplinary and empirically-focused approaches to the sub-national, regional
41
42 studies remains a broad sphere shaped by the interplay of its contributors and debates
43
44 unfolding in their specific disciplines, evolving empirical phenomena and their regional
45
46 manifestations and the internationalising foci of research and the geographies of
47
48 contributors (see, for example, Pike *et al.* 2007).
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

56
57
58 In the current period, recent work has raised fundamental questions about how we think
59
60 about and research ‘regions’ and regional change, ‘development’, governance and
 regulation. First, emergent conceptual ideas have introduced new thinking about space,

place and scale that interprets 'regions' as 'unbounded', relational spaces. This work has sought to disrupt notions of 'regions' as bounded territories. Hierarchical systems of scale have been questioned or even rejected by multi-scalar approaches that seek to reflect more fluid inter-relationships between the international, national, regional, local and community. Second, research methodology has grown in sophistication and sensitivity but remains somewhat polarised between the binaries of positivist, often quantitative, and more theoretically diverse, typically qualitative, approaches. Genuine synthesis and mixed methods are evident but perhaps still too elusive. Last, regional governance, policy and politics are wrestling with the conceptual, methodological and political complexities of new modes and geographies of governance and emergent multi-agent and multi-level institutional architectures. As one of several possible sub-national tiers, 'regions' appear to have no necessary place in more polycentric and multi-scalar systems of power and regulation. The status and agency of the region as a collective actor is not innate and pre-given in any specific geographical context (Lagendijk 2007, this issue). The concerns evident in contemporary regional studies mix new challenges with some thorny issues that have long been the subject of analysis and discussion (see, for example, Martin *et al.* 2003). While we are at an early stage in beginning to think through what such conceptual, theoretical, methodological, governance, policy and political innovations and developments mean for regional studies, the magnitude and resonance of such issues underpin the vitality of research on the region.

This special issue, then, seeks to contribute to and reflect upon the current issues and debates in regional studies. The editorial that follows does not attempt comprehensively to document the depth and nuance of current work. This challenge is taken up by our contributors. Instead, this editorial seeks only to highlight and outline some of the main issues animating research and practice in regional studies in relation to conceptualisation, methodology, governance, policy and politics. To close, it touches

1 upon possible concerns that may shape the evolution of regional studies. On the
2
3 occasion of the 40th anniversary of the journal *Regional Studies* in 2007, this collection
4
5 represents a forward look into the futures for regional studies and complements the 2007
6
7 publication of the special supplement of influential papers from the journal's first forty
8
9 years (see Pike *et al.* 2007).
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17

18 **Defining the region**
19

20
21
22 Determining what it is we mean when we think about the 'region' is a longstanding,
23
24 recurrent and fundamental issue in regional studies, originating in the pioneering work of
25
26 Herbertson (1905), Fawcett (1919) and de la Blache (1926). Definitions and
27
28 conceptualisations of the region are bound up with evolving attempts to interpret the
29
30 essence, meaning and nature of regional territory and its relations with economy,
31
32 society, polity and culture (see, *inter alia*, Agnew 2000; Lagendijk 2006; Massey 1979;
33
34 Paasi 2002; Storper, 1997). This long and diverse history imparts a breadth and variety
35
36 to regional studies that signals its strength but frustrates attempts easily to circumscribe
37
38 its scope. Amidst the recent resurgence of interest in the region in spatial disciplines and
39
40 social science more broadly, views have differed on how best to understand and practice
41
42 a regional approach (Hudson 2007; Jones and McCleod 2007, this issue). Arnoud
43
44 Lagendijk (2007, this issue) characterises this as a historical and ongoing struggle
45
46 between structuralism and functionalism, interpreting 'regions' as by-products of broader
47
48 changes, and voluntarism, seeing 'regions' as endowed with varying degrees and kinds
49
50 of agency.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Currently, a centrally important issue for regional studies concerns the ways in which
contemporary debates in thinking about space, place and scale have destabilised and

questioned the traditional and long-established notion of the 'region' as a 'closed', 'bounded' and territorial entity (see Hudson 2007; Jones and MacLeod 2007; Lagendijk 2007, this issue). Understanding 'regions' as fixed and demarcated units in the context of globalisation has been questioned alongside challenges to hierarchical notions of spatial scales, running from the global to the community in clearly delineated levels. This recent re-thinking of space, place and scale is based upon a relational approach that sees geographical entities – such as regions – as constituted by spatialised social relations stretched over space and manifest in material, discursive and symbolic forms (see Allen and Cochrane 2007, Lagendijk 2007, this issue; Amin 2004). In a more pronounced inter-connected and inter-dependent context, 'regions' are defined by their linkages and relations within and without any predefined territorial boundary. In this sense, regions are seen as open, porous and 'unbounded'. The topographical space of absolute distance is displaced by topological understandings of relative and discontinuous space, emphasising connections and nodes in networks.

While both strong and weak versions of relational thinking are evident in the literature, such ideas are profoundly challenging to regional studies. Where contributors to this special issue might make a distinctive advance in the debate is by demonstrating empirically the value of such ideas and arguing and demonstrating how it might be more productive to view these relational and territorial approaches not as competing 'either/or' choices but to see them from a 'both/and' perspective shaped by theoretical, methodological and political context (see Hudson 2007, this issue). Indeed, several of our contributors reveal the value of such an approach in tackling the challenge of developing genuinely multi-scalar understandings of regions, including Jones and Macleod's (2007, this issue) engagement with 'networked topologies' and Lagendijk's (2007, this issue) development of a strategic relational approach. Such work is perhaps only a beginning, however, and underlines the need for much further empirical

1 exploration. Difficulties will no doubt arise from the disjuncture of such research, primarily
2
3 situated within geography, with other constituencies and disciplines involved in regional
4
5 studies. Debates will likely resonate with concerns about the integrity and quality of
6
7 concepts and theory (Markusen 2003) and the need for analytical consistency and
8
9 definition (McCann 2007, this issue), especially if the research is concerned with
10
11 confronting relational thinking with questions of quantification, measurement, evaluation
12
13 and engagement with policy.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 **Researching the region**
24
25
26

27 Intertwined with conceptualisation and definition, how we research the region is a
28
29 similarly longstanding concern for regional studies given its strong empirical traditions
30
31 and is marked most recently by debates about methodological plurality and standards of
32
33 analysis and evidence (see, for example, the contributions in relation to Markusen 2003
34
35 in *Regional Studies*). While the sophistication and sensitivity of research methods in the
36
37 social sciences has grown in recent years, in regional research Phillip McCann (2007,
38
39 this issue) sees a continuing mismatch between what he interprets as the ‘stylised
40
41 constructs’ or somewhat loose conceptualisations translated and utilised in regional
42
43 policy frameworks and their inability to support empirical evaluation through hypothesis
44
45 formulation and testing. He situates his argument in a contrast drawn between a broad
46
47 and pluralistic disciplinary base of ‘regional studies’, typically deploying non-quantitative
48
49 and non-mathematical forms of analysis, and a narrower, more economics focused
50
51 ‘regional science’, utilising more mathematical and empirical approaches. The critical
52
53 problem is one of ‘observational equivalence’ (Overman 2004). That is, how to infer
54
55 causality and determine the most appropriate explanation from empirical observations for
56
57 which alternative and competing interpretations exist. For Phillip McCann (2007, this
58
59
60

issue), 'regional studies' is good at developing multiple conceptualisations, although they are not always founded on strong theoretical and empirical bases. But it is less effective at empirically verifying and testing its ideas.

Even if we accept the broad depiction of 'regional studies' and 'regional science' – or wish to debate it – such approaches may remain characterised as different in purpose, focus, the kinds of questions they can ask and answer, method, research design, analytical capability, policy implications and so on. Too strong readings of the ontological and epistemological differences in this interpretation may render or even deepen any divide. A more complementary even if difficult relationship may prove more productive. Indeed, Phillip McCann (2007, this issue) argues that 'regional studies' is useful in raising topical questions since it is more open and engaged in more widely based disciplinary dialogue and issues but 'regional science' is always required empirically to evaluate the usefulness and use of such ideas in public policy. Otherwise, he suggests, major difficulties for public policy design and evaluation will follow. Closer dialogue and relationships may, however, raise the possibility of synthesis and mixing in the context of appropriate and rigorously handled research designs. Indeed, innovation may become more pressing because the emergent and unsettling debates about space, place and scale present formidable issues for regional research strategy in terms of data specification, collection and analysis in the context of more open, unbounded and discontinuous spatial units.

Governance, policy, politics and the region

Governance, policy and politics are other critical dimensions of regional studies that have recently been subject to thorough going change and reflection. Emergent kinds of

1 networked and partnership governance involving multiple actors and forms of
2
3 participatory and democratic engagement (Hadjimichalis and Hudson 2006; Tomaney
4
5 and Pike 2006), processes and new geographies of devolution and multi-layering
6
7 amongst the institutions of government and governance (Jones and McCleod 2007,
8
9 Morgan 2007, this issue; Pike and Tomaney 2004; Rodríguez-Pose and Gill 2005) and
10
11 the emergence and articulation of new policy responsibilities such as science and
12
13 technology at the sub-national level (Perry and May 2007) – to name but a few
14
15 developments – have underpinned a more fluid and complex backdrop for considering
16
17 regional governance, policy and politics. Fundamental is the extent to which regions are
18
19 objects of policy and/or subjects endowed with the agency to shape, develop and deliver
20
21 policy (Hudson 2007, this issue). Power relations are critical in defining the 'region', its
22
23 interests and 'development', for instance in contesting the politics of collective provision
24
25 and consumption at the sub-national scale (Jonas and Ward 2004), challenging the
26
27 narrow mainstream economic focus on 'regional economic development' (Hudson 2007,
28
29 Pike *et al.* 2007, this issue) and interpreting the governance of regional firm networks
30
31 (Christopherson and Clark 2007, this issue).
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 Such is the depth and rapidity of recent change that discerning what current
43
44 developments mean for regional studies is challenging. Kevin Morgan (2007, this issue)
45
46 captures the essence of such uneven changes in regional governance, policy and
47
48 politics by reflecting upon the emergence of increasingly polycentric states wherein
49
50 multiple centres of deliberation and decision-making are at least challenging and
51
52 disturbing the certainties of formerly centralised, national and hierarchical structures. Yet,
53
54 drawing from empirical research in the UK, within this shifting context it remains an
55
56 empirical question whether recent changes are creating 'new spaces of empowerment
57
58 and engagement' and finding more sustainable balances between democracy and equity
59
60 (Morgan 2007, this issue). Significantly for those interested in the 'region', in this more

1 complex and changing context the 'region' appears to have no guaranteed place in
2
3 contexts within which the national central level retains a pivotal and often decisive role.
4
5 Indeed, as Kevin Morgan (2007, this issue) demonstrates, in the UK the very scale of the
6
7 'region' is being contested in the context of the promotion of emergent spatial
8
9 imaginaries at the 'city-region' and 'local' levels.
10
11
12
13
14

15
16 Elsewhere, the imprint of new thinking about discontinuous and unbounded space marks
17
18 interpretations of emergent regional governance and politics. Drawing upon their
19
20 empirical work on England's South East, John Allen and Allan Cochrane (2007, this
21
22 issue) deploy a relational approach to characterise the complex, multi-agent and multi-
23
24 scalar 'regional assemblage' that constitutes the governance of the region. For them, a
25
26 more diffuse and to a degree networked form of governance has underpinned the
27
28 emergence of a spatially discontinuous region. In this relatively strong relational view,
29
30 grounded in empirical research, such change is not best captured by the territorial
31
32 approach, despite its more flexible spatial vocabulary and conceptualisations of
33
34 'regionalisation' and state re-scaling (see Jones and McLeod 2007, this issue). As
35
36 suggested above, however, rather than constructing unhelpful binaries, thinking of
37
38 relational and territorial approaches as complementary might prove constructive even if
39
40 challenging to undertake given the potentially very different questions and forms of
41
42 analysis they suggest. For Kevin Morgan (2007, this issue), for example, political space
43
44 is bounded in administrative and electoral territories *and* porous through people's
45
46 multiple identities, mobilities and relations across space and place. A challenging
47
48 regional research agenda, then, might be concerned with examining the ways in which
49
50 existing institutions of representative democracy wedded to the territorial space of
51
52 political jurisdiction struggle to address issues of democratic renewal and participation in
53
54 the changing political context (see, for example, Massey 2004; Tomaney and Pike 2006).
55
56
57
58
59
60

Recent developments raise the question of the place of regional studies in regional politics and policy. Regional studies have long grappled with their relationships and relevance to the politics and public policy of government and governance (Hadjimichalis and Hudson 2007; Markusen 2003). The Regional Studies Association and *Regional Studies* journal have historically had policy engagement at their heart, marking out a distinct and to varying degrees a separate trajectory from regional science from the 1960s (Pike *et al.* 2007). Regional studies is not alone in this regard. Geography, for example, has constantly struggled with questions of relevancy, influence and policy practicality (e.g. Martin 2001). A recurrent issue is the degree of incorporation into or distance from the political and policy process. The traditionally conceptually and theoretically robust and empirically grounded research in regional studies should have much to offer, although engagement is not without its difficulties and frustrations due to different priorities, rhythms, timescales and languages (Peck 1999). Critical regional research, for instance, may not always be well received in the context of more narrowly defined and limited research needs. Examples of independent views articulated in this special issue include the fundamental questioning of what is meant by 'development' and its distributional implications in localities and regions (Pike *et al.* 2007, this issue) and Christopherson and Clark's (2007, this issue) challenge of the policy support for TNC and SME network co-operation given TNC's tendencies to dominate the resources critical to innovation including university R&D and skilled labour markets. The context of more complex governance structures within which regional studies is practised and, perhaps, seeks to engage makes its relationship with regional policy and politics no less problematic.

Conclusions

This editorial has sought to sketch out several of the critical issues for regional studies relating to concepts and theory, research methodology, and governance, policy and politics. The contributors to the special issue that follows connect with the critical issues outlined above and, in so doing, provide thoughts and reflections of value to the contemporary debates in regional studies. It remains to reflect upon potential issues shaping the possible futures for regional studies. First, current research contains plentiful reasons to prompt reflection upon the fundamental questions concerning the purpose and aims of regional studies. What is regional studies for and what is it trying to achieve? But one response suggests that, as researchers in regional studies, we need to become more explicit in recognizing and, where appropriate, articulating the normative content and intent of our work (Markusen 2006). Pike, Rodríguez-Pose and Tomaney (2007, this issue), for example, have argued this much in their version of more holistic, progressive and sustainable forms of 'development' at the local and regional levels. Clearly, this stance is more of an issue for debate and challenge to those approaching regional studies from a positivist stance. Second, we might consider where regional studies sits and what it might have to contribute to the 'spatial turn' in social sciences more broadly (Grabher 2006) and even to the emergent notion of 'postdisciplinary studies' (Sayer 2000). Breaking down disciplinary (and sub-disciplinary) boundaries within and without regional studies may be fruitful albeit difficult. One example might be re-engaging with the internationalism evident at the founding of regional studies in the late 1960s but reworking it in the current context of the blurring between the formerly more discrete and separate domains of 'Development Studies' in 'developing' and 'transition' contexts and 'Regional and Local Development' in 'developed' countries (see, for example, Pike *et al.* 2006; Scott and Storper 2003). Reflected in this journal (Pike *et al.* 2007), in terms of the geographical focus of its research and contributors regional studies has grown and

1 extended from its Anglo-American origins in the 1960s through ‘Europeanisation’ in the
2
3 1980s and 1990s to an emergent and growing internationalism addressing the insights
4
5 and challenges of conceptual, empirical and policy developments especially in Asia (see,
6
7 for example, Zhiang and Wu 2006). At the very least, perhaps opening up dialogue with
8
9 other disciplines and sub-disciplines about what regional studies is, where it is heading
10
11 and what it can contribute may be fruitful (see Pike *et al.* 2007). Research issues shared
12
13 across disciplines provide a common ground upon which to work involving longstanding
14
15 concerns about growth, innovation, agglomeration, spatial inequalities, welfare and
16
17 equity and disparities alongside emergent topics such as the evaluation of
18
19 competitiveness and growth-oriented spatial policy, especially at the national and supra-
20
21 national levels (Bachtler and Wren 2006), living, working and mobility (Bramley *et al.*
22
23 2006; Jones *et al.* 2006), creativity and entrepreneurship (McGranahan and Wojan 2007;
24
25 Fritsch and Falck 2006), social and spatial justice (Johnston *et al.* 2006); sustainability
26
27 and the post-carbon economy (Morgan 2004; Zuideau 2006) and wellbeing and quality
28
29 of life (Brown and Rees 2006; Marchante and Ortega 2006). New methodologies,
30
31 techniques and applications too have their place in encouraging such cross-disciplinary
32
33 dialogue (e.g. Baussola 2007; Lundberg 2006). A productive future for regional studies
34
35 can be envisaged, then, providing strength in and through multi- and inter-disciplinary
36
37 approaches to empirically grounded and policy sensitive research.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 **Acknowledgements**

54
55 Thanks to Neill Marshall, the four anonymous reviewers and John Tomaney for their
56
57 feedback on this editorial. Thanks also to the contributors to this Special Issue, the
58
59 reviewers and the participants in the ‘Whither regional studies?’ session at the AAG
60
Annual Meeting in Chicago, March 2006. The usual disclaimers, as always, apply.

References

Agnew J (2000) "From the political economy of regions to regional political economy", *Progress in Human Geography*, 24, 101-110.

Allen, J. and Cochrane, A. (2007) "Beyond the territorial fix: regional assemblages, politics and power", *Regional Studies*, XXXX

Amin, A. (2004) "Regions unbound: Towards a new politics of place", *Geografiska Annaler*, 86 B, 33-44.

Bachtler, J. and Wren, C. (2006) "Evaluation of European Union Cohesion policy: Research questions and policy challenges", *Regional Studies*, 40, 2, 143-153.

Baussola, M. (2007) "Modelling a regional economic system: The case of Lombardy", *Regional Studies*, 41, 1, 19-38.

Bramley, G., Champion, T. and Fisher, T. (2006) "Exploring the household impacts of migration in Britain using panel survey data", *Regional Studies*, 40, 8, 907-926.

Brown, D. and Rees, P. (2006) "Trends in local and small area mortality and morbidity in Yorkshire and the Humber: Monitoring health inequalities", *Regional Studies*, 40, 5, 437-458.

- Christopherson, S. and Clark, J. (2007) "Power in firm networks: What it means for regional innovation systems", *Regional Studies*, XXXX
- Fritsch, M. and Falck, O. (2007) "New business formation by industry over space and time: A multidimensional analysis", *Regional Studies*, 41, 2, 157-172.
- Grabher, G. (2006) "Trading routes, bypasses, and risky intersections: Mapping the travels of networks between economic sociology and economic geography", *Progress in Human Geography*, 30, 2, 163-189.
- Hadjimichalis, C. and Hudson, R. (2006) "Networks, regional development and democratic control", *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 30, 4, 858–872.
- Hadjimichalis, C. and Hudson, R. (2007) "Re-thinking local and regional development: Implications for radical political practice", *European Urban and Regional Studies*, XXXX.
- Herbertson A (1905) "The major natural regions: an essay in systematic geography", *Geographical Journal*, 25, 300-312
- Hudson, R. (2007) "Regions and regional uneven development forever? Some reflective comments upon theory and practice", *Regional Studies*, XXXX
- Johnston, R., Burgess, S., Wilson, D. and Harris, R. (2006) "School and residential ethnic segregation: An analysis of variations across England's local education authorities", *Regional Studies*, 40, 9, 973-990.

1
2
3
4 Jones, M. (2005) Towards 'Phase Spatiality': Regions, Regional Studies and the Limits
5
6 to Thinking Space Relationally, Institute of Geography and Earth Sciences, University of
7
8 Wales, Aberystwyth.
9

10
11
12
13 Jones, M., Goodwin, M. and Jones, R. (2005) "State modernization, devolution and
14
15 economic governance: an introduction and guide to debate", Regional Studies, 39, 397-
16
17 403.
18
19

20
21
22
23 Jones, M. and McCleod, G. (2007) "In what sense and regional world? Institutional
24
25 legacies, territorial fixes, network topologies", Regional Studies, XXXX
26
27

28
29
30 Jones, M. K., Latreille, P. L. and Sloane, P. J. (2006) "Disability, gender and the labour
31
32 market in Wales", Regional Studies, 40, 8, 823-846.
33
34

35
36
37 Lagendijk, A. (2006) "Learning from conceptual flow in regional studies: Framing present
38
39 debates, unbracketing past debates", Regional Studies, 40, 4, 385-400.
40
41

42
43
44 Lagendijk, A. (2007) "The accident of the region. A strategic relational perspective on the
45
46 construction of the region's significance", Regional Studies, XXXX
47
48

49
50
51 Lundberg, J. (2006) "Using spatial econometrics to analyse local growth in Sweden",
52
53 Regional Studies, 40, 3, 303-316.
54
55

56
57
58 Marchante, A. J. and Ortega, B. (2006) "Quality of life and economic convergence across
59
60 Spanish regions, 1980-2001", Regional Studies, 40, 5, 47-484.

Markusen, A. (2003) "Fuzzy concepts, scanty evidence, policy distance: the case for rigor and policy relevance in critical regional studies", *Regional Studies*, 37, 6/7, 699-715.

Markusen, A. (2006) "Economic geography and political economy" in S. Bagchi-Sen and H. Lawton-Smith (Eds) *Economic Geography: Past, Present, Future*, Routledge: London, 94-102.

Martin, R. (2001) "Geography and public policy: the case of the missing manifesto", *Progress in Human Geography*, 25, 2, 121-137.

Martin, R., Tyler, P., Gray, M., Fingleton, B., McCombie, J., Kitson, M., Glasmeier, A. and Asheim, B. (2003) "Rethinking the regions", *Regional Studies*, 37, 6/7, 545-546.

Massey, D. (1978) "In what sense a regional problem?", *Regional Studies*, 13, 2, 233-243.

Massey D (2004) "Geographies of responsibility", *Geografiska Annaler*, 86B, 5-18

McCann, P. (2007) "Observational equivalence? Regional Studies and Regional Science", *Regional Studies*, XXXX

McGranahan, D. and Wojan, T. (2007) "Recasting the creative class to examine growth processes in rural and urban counties", *Regional Studies*, 41, 2, 197-216.

Morgan, K. (2004) 'Sustainable regions: governance, innovation and scale', *European Planning Studies*, 12 (6): 871-19.

Morgan, K. (2007) "The polycentric state: New spaces of empowerment and engagement?", *Regional Studies*, XXXX

Overman, H. G. (2004) "Can we learn anything from Economic Geography proper?", *Journal of Economic Geography*, 4, 501-516.

Paasi, A. (2002) "Place and region: regional worlds and regional words", *Progress in Human Geography*, 26, 802-811.

Peck, J. (1999) "Editorial: grey geography?", *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 24, 131–135.

Perry, B. and May, T. (2007) "Introduction XXXX", *Regional Studies*, XXXX

Pike, A., Bristow, G., Coombes, M., Fan, C., Gillespie, A., Harris, R., Hull, A., Marshall, N. and Wren, C. (2007) "Editorial: *Regional Studies*: Forty years and more...", *Regional Studies*, 41, S1, S1-S8.

Pike, A., Rodríguez-Pose, A. and Tomaney, J. (2007) "What kind of local and regional development for whom?", *Regional Studies*, XXXX

Pike, A., Rodríguez-Pose, A. and Tomaney, J. (2006) *Local and Regional Development*, Routledge: London.

Rodríguez-Pose, A. and Gill, N. (2005) "On the 'economic dividend' of devolution." *Regional Studies*, 39, 4, 405-420.

1
2
3
4 Sayer, A. (2000) "For postdisciplinary studies: Sociology and the curse of disciplinary
5 parochialism/imperialism" in J. Eldridge, J. MacInnes, S. Scott, C. Warhurst and A. Witz
6 (Eds.) Sociologies: Legacies and Prospects, Sociologypress: Durham, 85-9.
7
8
9

10
11
12
13 Scott, A. and Storper, M. (2003) "Regions, globalization, development", Regional
14 Studies, 37, 6/7, 579-593.
15
16

17
18
19
20 Storper, M. (1997) The Regional World. Territorial Development in a Global Economy.
21 London: Guilford.
22
23
24

25
26
27 Tomaney, J. and Pike, A. (2006) "Deepening democracy and engaging civil society?
28 'Economic and social partners' and devolved governance in the UK", Regional and
29 Federal Studies, 16, 2, 129-135.
30
31
32
33

34
35
36
37 Ward, K. and Jonas, A. E. G. (2004) "Competitive city-regionalism as a politics of space:
38 a critical reinterpretation of the new regionalism", Environment and Planning A, 36, 12,
39 2119–2139.
40
41
42

43
44
45
46 Zhiang, J. and Wu, F. (2006) "China's changing economic governance: Administrative
47 annexation and the reorganization of local governments in the Yangtze River Delta",
48 Regional Studies, 40, 1, 3-22.
49
50
51

52
53
54
55
56 Zuindeau, B. (2006) "Spatial approach to sustainable development: Challenges of equity
57 and efficiency", Regional Studies, 40, 5, 459-470.
58
59
60